

REMARKS

Claims 2 and 9-11 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 2, 9 and 10 presently stand rejected. Applicants add claim 11 to further define the invention as discussed below.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the phone interviews of August 2 and 14, 2007.

I. Rejections under § 112

Claims 2, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicants amend the claims along the lines discussed during the telephone interviews between the Examiner and Applicants' representative on August 2 and 14. These changes are believed to overcome any ambiguities.

As noted in the specification, an alarm considered to be most prioritized to other alarms is displayed with highlighting, blinking or some other similar manner which is easy to ascertain for the user. With this feature, the nature of the most important alarm for each patient can be viewed simultaneously.

Thus, if an alarm goes off for two or more patients at the same time, they can both be visually recognized by the user simultaneously. For instance, FIG. 2 illustrates an example where two of the eight beds being monitored are undergoing alarm conditions, which are displayed as "ASYSTOLE" and "VT" with highlighting and/or blinking.

II. Prior Art Rejections

Claims 2, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bufe et al. (6,731,311).

The Examiner also indicates that claims 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bufe et al. (6,731,311) in view of Kirshner (6,322,504). However, claims 3-8 have been canceled from the application. This rejection appears to be mistakenly carried over from the previous Office Action.

Claim 1 recites displaying alarm information corresponding to a most prioritized one of the alarm conditions for each of the plurality of patients, based on the prioritization of the plurality of alarm conditions when a plurality of the vital signs of any one of the plurality of patients are in the alarm conditions.

The present invention addresses a situation in which a plurality of alarm conditions are simultaneously provided with respect to a single patient. With the invention, it is possible for the caregiver to identify the most prioritized alarm out of all the alarms for that patient.

In the Office Action, the Examiner seems to allege that Col. 4, Lines 28-32 of Bufe teaches the claimed displaying based on the prioritization. However, this portion describes the situation that a plurality of alarm condition are simultaneously triggered from a plurality of different beds, and thus, for a plurality of patients. Bufe fails to teach the claimed situation that a plurality of alarm conditions are simultaneously triggered for each of the patients, and identifying the most prioritized of those conditions for each of the patients, thereby, displaying the most prioritized one of the alarm conditions for any one of the patients.

Moreover, Bufe does not actually store predetermined priority information for prioritizing a plurality of alarm conditions with respect to each other, so that an alarm condition considered to be most prioritized to other alarm conditions can be determined. In fact, Bufe does not rank the alarm conditions at all.

The Office Action asserts that Bufo ranks each alarm the same, i.e., “each alarm condition has the same rank.” (page 6, Final Office Action). However, this precludes the possibility of determining an alarm condition considered to be most prioritized to the other alarm conditions, as recited in claim 2. That is, as asserted in the Office Action, if all alarms have the same rank, one of the alarms can’t be the most prioritized as compared to the others.

In view of the foregoing, claim 2 is believed patentable over Bufo.

Moreover, claims 9 and 10 are patentable for the same reasons as claim 2. Namely, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest a monitor or monitoring system in which alarm information corresponding to a most prioritized one of the alarm conditions for each of the patients, based on the prioritization of the plurality of alarm conditions, is displayed, when a plurality of the vital signs of any one of the patients are in the alarm condition.

III. New Claim:

Applicants add claim 11 to clarify that the most prioritized alarm information is displayed in a different manner than the other information being displayed. This enables the user to easily identify the most important alarm condition on the display screen. This claim is fully supported by FIG. 2 and paragraph [0080] of the published application.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Application No.: 10/090,165

Attorney Docket No.: Q68836

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ellen R. Smith/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 24, 2007

Ellen R. Smith
Registration No. 43,042